

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/986,136

**Applicant(s)**

SOHN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dawn Garrett

**Art Unit**

1774

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dawn Garrett.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Eugene Lee.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 17, and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner noted two misspelled words in claims 1 and 18. With regard to claim 17, the examiner noted that the method step had been omitted in a prior amendment. With regard to claim 18, the examiner noted that formula (1) is not a monomer for copolymerization to form formula (3). Applicant's representative proposed the attached amendment for claim 18 citing support for the halogenated monomer from the specification at paragraph 30, which discloses Gilch polymerization through dehydrohalogenation and discloses a halogenated monomer. Applicant's representative, Eugene Lee, approved the attached examiner's amendment in its entirety .